APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,455	01/15/2004	Khiem Le	39700-78300IUS/NC37129US	5064

64046   7590   12/08/2009
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER
CHEEMA, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 November 2009</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
     1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
     2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
     3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on

11/13/2009. Claims 1-26 are pending in this action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

11/13/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant argues that Jonsson in view of Banerji and McBride does not teach or

suggest, a first and second algorithm configured to determine whether a packet is to be

compressed, as claimed in impendent claim 1 and similarly in independent claims, 6,

11, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, and 25, limitation. Applicant's arguments have been fully

considered but arguments are not persuasive. As stated in previous rejection, Jonsson

is related to generally packet communication and, more particularly to header

compression/decompression in packet communication (see col. 1, lines 10-12). Further

as acknowledged in Applicant's remarks, McBride discloses receiving a frame and

checking whether it is compressed. However, Applicant believed that McBride does not

suggest an algorithm used to determine whether to compress the frame. Examiner

would like to clarify that McBride discloses (see Figure 2-3 and details associated in

specification) algorithm of whether to compress the frame is being addressed. Applicant

further argues that the frame or header compression is not same as Applicant's claimed

compressed packet. With regards to Applicant's argument, Applicant employs broad

language which includes the use of words and phrases which have broad meaning in

the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim

language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning

to the limitations (for Example: Applicant has not further explained "Packet", either in

claim or in specification, therefore Examiner is understanding a packet as a frame, a

header, or a packet as recited in each of the cited references). As the claims breath

allows multiple interpretations and meaning which are broader than Applicant's

disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly as

reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Again,

claims are interpreted in light of the specification; limitations from the specification are

not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 998 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed.

Cir. 1993). "[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into

account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one

skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401

F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). See MPEP 2144.01.

4.   Thus, is Examiner's position that cited references for at least given reasons

above teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1-26. Therefore, 35 U.S.C

103(a) rejection to claims 1-26 is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.,* 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jonsson et al (Jonsson) (US Patent # 6,970,476) in view of Banerji et al (Banerji) (US

2003/0012278) and further in view of McBride et al (McBride) (US 6,151,627).

2. Regarding claims 1 and 25, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed a

method and a computer readable program, comprising: selectively updating a

compression history at a compressor (context updating), based on a first algorithm

configured to determine whether a packet is to be compressed, and based on a second

algorithm configured to determine whether a compressed packet is to be used for the

updating of the compression history (see abstract, packet header communications that

utilize header compression/decompression, col. 11, lines 10-19; context updating
between first and second packet communication station).

3.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,
Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the
compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the
compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

4.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet
(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the
compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that
can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

5.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data
communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data
value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless
compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent
compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

6.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed
invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well
known in the art at the time of the present invention.

7.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station of compression history etc.) (see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-3, 5-7 and details associated).

8.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple functionalities of the system.

9.   Regarding claim 2, Jonsson-Banerji discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising: ensuring a history consistency between a compressor and a decompressor by using transmission control protocol, wherein the compressor monitors an acknowledgment signaling of a transmission control protocol receiver (see Jonsson: col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 9, lines 55-60; Banerji: see par. 0010-0011).

10.   Regarding claim 3, Jonsson-Banerji discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising: ensuring a history consistency between a compressor and a decompressor by using a feedback between the compressor and the decompressor (see Jonsson: col. 10, lines 5-9; Banerji: see par. 0010-0011).

11.   Regarding claim 4, Jonsson-Banerji disclose the method according to claim 2, further comprising: enabling the compressor to safely infer a subset of a first context at the decompressor by monitoring the transmission control protocol acknowledgment

signaling, wherein the subset is used as a second context for compression (see

Jonsson: col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 9, lines 55-60; Banerji: see par. 0035).

12.   Regarding claim 5, Jonsson-Banerji disclose the method according to claim 1,

further comprising: ensuring a history consistency between a compressor and a

decompressor by combining use of transmission control protocol, wherein the

compressor monitors an acknowledgment signaling of a transmission control protocol

receiver, with use of a feedback between the compressor and the decompressor (see

Jonsson: col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 9, lines 55-60; Banerji: see par. 0035).

13.   Regarding claims 6 and 26, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed a

method and a computer readable program, comprising: using a first algorithm in

conjunction with a compressing device to decide if a current packet should be

compressed; using a second algorithm in conjunction with the compressing device to

decide which packets out of packets sent compressed are to be used to update a buffer

of the compressing device (see col. 11, lines 10-19; context updating between first and

second packet communication station); and signaling from the compressing device to a

decompressing device such that the decompressing device knows which of the packets

out of the packets sent are to be included in a compression history (see figure 2, col. 4,

lines 41-49).

14.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,

Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the

compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the

compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

15.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet
(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the
compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that
can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

16.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data
communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data
value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless
compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent
compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

17.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed
invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well
known in the art at the time of the present invention.

18.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station
of compression history etc.) (see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-
3, 5-7 and details associated).

19.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in

the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple

functionalities of the system.

20.   Regarding claim 7, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see

claim 2 above).

21.   Regarding claim 8, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see

claim 4 above).

22.   Regarding claim 9, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see

claim 3 above).

23.   Regarding claim 10, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see

claim 5 above).

24.   Regarding claim 11, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed above an

apparatus, comprising: processor configured to update a compression history

selectively, the processor having implemented and being configured to process a first

algorithm related to whether a packet shall be compressed, and a second algorithm

related to whether a compressed packet shall be used for an update of the compression

history (see col. 11, lines 10-19; context updating between first and second packet

communication station).

25.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,

Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the

compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the

compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

26.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet
(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the
compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that
can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

27.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data
communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data
value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless
compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent
compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

28.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed
invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well
known in the art at the time of the present invention.

29.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station
of compression history etc.) (see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-
3, 5-7 and details associated).

30.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in

the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple

functionalities of the system.

31.   Regarding claim 12, Jonsson-Banerji disclose apparatus according to claim 11,

further comprising: monitor configured to monitor an acknowledgment signaling of a

transmission control protocol receiver, wherein the monitor is operably connected to the

processor (see Jonsson: col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 9, lines 55-60; Banerji: see par. 0010-

0011).

32.   Regarding claim 13, Jonsson-Banerji disclose the apparatus according to claim

12, wherein said monitor is configured to be enabled to safely infer a subset of a first

context at a decompressor by monitoring transmission control protocol acknowledgment

signaling, wherein the subset is used as a second context for compression (see

Jonsson: col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 7, lines 20-25, figure 2; Banerji: see par. 0010-0011).

33.   Regarding claim 14, Jonsson-Banerji disclose the apparatus according to claim

11, further comprising: establisher configured to establish a feedback between the

compression device and a decompression device, wherein the establisher is operably

connected to the processor (see Jonsson: col. 10, lines 5-9, col. 7, lines 20-25; Banerji:

see par. 0010-0011).

34.   Regarding claim 15, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed an apparatus,

comprising: a transmitter configured to signal to a decompression device which of a first

set of packets are to be included in a compression history, the transmitter having

implemented and processing a first algorithm used to decide if the current packet should

be compressed and (see figure 2, col. 4, lines 41-49); processor configured to have

implemented and to process a second algorithm, wherein the second algorithm is used

to determine which of a second set of packets out of a third set of packets sent

compressed are to be used to update a buffer, wherein the processor is operably

connected to the transmitter (see col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 7, lines 20-25, figure 2).

35.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,

Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the

compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the

compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

36.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet

(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the

compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that

can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

37.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the

teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data

communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data

value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless

compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent

compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

38.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed

invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and

second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

39.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station of compression history etc.)(see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-3, 5-7 and details associated).

40.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple functionalities of the system.

41.   Regarding claim 16, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see claim 12 above).

42.   Regarding claim 17, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see claim 13 above).

43.   Regarding claim 18, the limitations of this claim has already been addressed (see claim 14 above).

44.   Regarding claim 19, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed an apparatus, comprising: a receiver configured to receive signals from a compression device indicating which packets are to be included in a compression history (see col. 6, lines 58-65, figure 6; receiving context updating request); and a processor configured to process a packet sequence number for updating a buffer in synchronization with the

compression device, wherein the processor is operably connected to the receiver (see
col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 7, lines 20-25, figure 2).

45.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,
Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the
compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the
compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

46.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet
(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the
compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that
can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

47.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data
communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data
value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless
compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent
compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

48.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed
invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well
known in the art at the time of the present invention.

49.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and

second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station

of compression history etc.)(see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-3,

5-7 and details associated).

50.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the

teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in

the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple

functionalities of the system.

51.   Regarding claim 20, Jonsson-Banerji disclose the apparatus according to claim

19, further comprising: forwarding unit configured to forward an acknowledgment

signaling of a transmission control protocol receiver to the compression device, wherein

the forwarding unit is operably connected to the receiver (see Jonsson: figure 6, col. 6,

lines 53-60, col. 2, lines 35-40; Banerji: see par. 0010-0011).

52.   Regarding claim 21, Jonsson-Banerji disclose the apparatus according to claim

19, further comprising: an establishing unit configured to establish a feedback between

the compression device and the decompression device, wherein the establishing means

is operably connected to the receiver (see Jonsson: col. 10, lines 5-9, col. 7, lines 20-

25; Banerji: see par. 0010-0011).

53.   Regarding claim 22, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed an apparatus,

comprising: updating means for updating a compression history selectively, the

updating means for implementing and processing a first algorithm related to whether a

packet shall be compressed, and a second algorithm related to whether a compressed

packet shall be used for an update of the compression history (see col. 11, lines 10-19,

col. 6, lines 37-42; context updating between first and second packet communication

station); and monitoring means operably connected to the updating means for

monitoring an acknowledgement signaling.

54.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,

Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the

compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the

compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

55.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet

(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the

compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that

can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

56.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the

teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data

communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data

value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless

compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent

compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

57.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed

invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and

second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

58.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station of compression history etc.) (see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-3, 5-7 and details associated).

59.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple functionalities of the system.

60.   Regarding claim 23, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed an apparatus, comprising: signaling means for signaling a decompression device which of a first set of packets are to be included in the compression history, the signaling means having implemented and processing a first algorithm used to decide if the current packet should be compressed (see figure 2, col. 4, lines 41-49); and processor means for having implementing and processing a second algorithm, wherein the second algorithm is used to determine which of a second set of packets out of a third set of packets sent compressed are to be used to update the buffer, wherein processor is operably connected to the means for signaling (see col. 2, lines 35-40, col. 7, lines 20-25, figure 2).

61.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,

Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the

compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the

compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

62.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet

(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the

compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that

can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

63.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the

teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data

communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data

value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless

compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent

compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

64.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed

invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and

second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well

known in the art at the time of the present invention.

65.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and

second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station

of compression history etc.)(see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-3,

5-7 and details associated).

66.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the

teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in

the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple

functionalities of the system.

67.   Regarding claim 24, Jonsson discloses the invention as claimed an apparatus,

comprising: receiving means for receiving signals from a compression device indicating

which packets are to be included in a compression history (see col. 6, lines 58-65, figure

6; receiving context updating request); processing means for processing a packet

sequence number for updating the buffer in synchronization with the compression

device, wherein the processor is operably connected to the receiving means (see col. 2,

lines 35-40, col. 7, lines 20-25, figure 2).

68.   Although Jonsson discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed invention,

Jonsson fails to disclose: compressed packet is to be used for the updating of the

compression history. Nevertheless, compressed packet is to be used to update of the

compression history was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

69.   In analogous teaching, Banerji exemplifies this where compressed packet

(compression algorithm for compressing packets) is to be used for the updating of the

compression history (exploit data history being updated) (compression algorithm that

can exploit data history from the beginning of each file, see Banerji: ¶¶ [0010-0011])

70.   Thus, given teaching of Banerji, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of Banerji and Jonsson for compression efficiency in a packet data
communication system. Motivation for doing so would have been that because data
value tends to have similar statistical properties within such a file, a lossless
compression algorithm can subsequently exploit the similarities for excellent
compression performance (see Banerji, ¶ [0026]).

71.   Although Jonsson-Banerji discloses substantial features of applicant's claimed
invention, Jonsson-Banerji fails to disclose: wherein used multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithms) are being used. Nevertheless, using of multiple algorithms was well
known in the art at the time of the present invention.

72.   In analogous teaching, McBride exemplifies using multiple algorithms (first and
second algorithm) (multiple algorithms are being used to determine transmitting station
of compression history etc.) (see McBride, abstract, col. 2, line 58-col.3, line 26, Fig. 2-
3, 5-7 and details associated).

73.   Thus, given teaching of McBride, it would have been obvious to one of the
ordinary skill in the art of networking at the time of this invention to combine the
teaching of McBride into Jonsson-Banerji for using multiple algorithms. As well known in
the art it would have been advantageously determining or perform multiple
functionalities of the system.

Conclusion

74.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to UMAR CHEEMA whose telephone number is (571)270-
3037. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM-5:00PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, William Jr. Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/U. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2444
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444